

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
WESTERN DIVISION AT DAYTON

Cathy Cooper,

*Plaintiff,*

v.

Case No. 3:17-cv-374  
Judge Thomas M. Rose

Andrew Saul, Commissioner of Social Security,

*Defendant.*

---

**ENTRY AND ORDER OVERRULING OBJECTION TO REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS BY DEFENDANT COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY, (ECF 17), ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS, (ECF 15), REMANDING TO THE SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION CONSISTENT WITH THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS AND TERMINATING CASE.**

---

Plaintiff Cathy Cooper filed an action in this Court seeking judicial review of a prior decision by the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration denying Plaintiff's application for Social Security benefits. United States Magistrate Judge Sharon L. Ovington filed a Report and Recommendations (ECF 15) recommending that the Commissioner's decision be vacated and remanded to the Social Security Administration under sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) for further consideration. The Commissioner has filed an objection to the Report and Recommendations. (ECF 17).

As required by 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b), the Court

has made a *de novo* review of the record in this case. Upon said review, the Court finds that the Report and Recommendation is correct. Wherefore, the Court **ADOPTS** Report and Recommendations of United States Magistrate Judge Sharon L. Ovington, (ECF 15), **DENIES** the Objection of the Commissioner, (ECF 17); **REMANDS** this case to the Social Security Administration under sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) for further consideration consistent with this Report and Recommendations,<sup>1</sup> and **TERMINATES** this case on the dockets of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Ohio, Western Division at Dayton.

**DONE** and **ORDERED** this Friday, November 15, 2019.

s/Thomas M. Rose

---

THOMAS M. ROSE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

---

<sup>1</sup> No finding is hereby made as to whether Plaintiff was under a “disability” within the meaning of the Social Security Act.